

for the relief of persons suffering from stomach ailments caused by improper diet, irregular eating habits, consuming too many acid-producing foods, or over-eating. The article would not be efficacious for such conditions.

The article was alleged to be misbranded further (1) in that the statement of active ingredients, "contain: Bismuth Subcarbonate; Magnesium Oxide; Sodium Bicarbonate; Saccharine; Rochelle Salt," appearing on the box label of the article, was not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness as to render it likely to be read under customary conditions of purchase and use; (2) in that its labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use since the directions did not provide a limitation as to duration of use; and (3) in that its labeling did not bear a warning that the article should not be used when abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, or other symptoms of appendicitis were present, and that frequent or continued use might result in dependence on laxatives.

On April 4, 1945, Udga, Inc., claimant, having admitted the facts in the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1359. Adulteration and misbranding of Pso-Ridisal. U. S. v. 38 Packages and 83 Gross of Pso-Ridisal. Consent decrees of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. Nos. 6679, 11683. Sample Nos. 86401-E, 66407-F, 66408-F, 66443-F.)

On or about January 17 and 28, 1944, the United States attorneys for the Northern District of Illinois and the Western District of Missouri filed libels against 38 packages of Pso-Ridisal at Chicago, Ill., and 83 gross of the same product at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped from Royal Oak, Mich., by the Nu-Basic Products Co., between the approximate dates of November 19, 1941, and December 15, 1943. The libels against the Missouri and Illinois lots were amended on or about February 14 and 23, 1944, respectively.

Analysis of samples disclosed that the article consisted essentially of sulfanilamide, mineral oil, glycerin, small proportions of carbolic acid, and soap and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements appearing in the labeling of each lot regarding the efficacy of the article in the treatment of psoriasis, and certain additional statements in the labeling of the Missouri lot regarding the efficacy of the article in the treatment of skin diseases, including athlete's foot, dandruff, eczema, acne, diaper rash, and industrial dermatitis, were false and misleading since the article would not be efficacious in the treatment of the conditions mentioned.

The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that its labeling failed to bear adequate warnings, since the article contained sulfanilamide and its labeling failed to warn that its use should be discontinued if a new skin rash appeared or if the skin condition under treatment became worse.

The article in the Illinois lot was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength differed from that which it was represented to possess since its labeling represented that each fluid ounce contained $\frac{3}{8}$ grain of sulfanilamide, whereas each fluid ounce contained 6.7 grains of sulfanilamide.

On June 30, 1942, the Nu-Basic Products Co. having appeared as claimant for the Illinois lot and having requested that the case be removed for trial to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan on the ground that that district was in reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, the court, after due consideration, entered an order denying the claimant's request for a change of venue. Thereafter, the Nu-Basic Products Co. appeared as claimant in the case of the Missouri lot and, pursuant to a motion filed by the claimant, an order was entered on April 11, 1944, providing for the removal of the case to the Northern District of Illinois. On April 12 and 26, 1944, the claimant having admitted the facts of the libels, judgments of condemnation were entered in each case and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1360. Misbranding of Sulfa-Seb and Sulfa-Ped. U. S. v. 50½ Dozen Bottles of Sulfa-Seb and 17½ Dozen Bottles of Sulfa-Ped. Tried to the court. Judgment for the Government. Decree ordering the condemnation and destruction of the labeling and the release of the product to the claimant. (F. D. C. No. 11075. Sample Nos. 3933-F, 3934-F.)

On or about November 10, 1943, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri filed a libel against 50½ dozen bottles of Sulfa-Seb and 17½ dozen bottles of Sulfa-Ped at Kansas City, Mo. On February 14, 1944, an amended libel was filed. It was alleged that the articles had been shipped on